

### Remarks

This is responsive to the Office Action mailed May 21, 2003. The various parts of the Office Action (and other matters, if any) are discussed below under appropriate headings.

The courtesy of Examiner Lesperance in conducting a personal interview with the inventor James L. Ferguson, and the undersigned on July 17, 2003 is noted with appreciation. During the interview the Examiner agreed to withdraw the final rejection. The Examiner agreed that the applied Takahashi U.S. Patent No. 6,130,784 does not teach two displays with polarization for both being the same so that the images can be separated based on polarization. The Examiner said he would update the search and provide a new Office Action or allow the application. During the interview a proposal was made to amend several claims, and those amendments are made herein.

Favorable consideration of this application respectfully is requested.

The application includes claims 1-36, 39, 40, and 43-54.

Claim 30 has been allowed, and claims 10, 11, 14, 23-26, and 29 have been indicated allowable.

Claims 1, 4, 16, 30, 31, 34, 39 and 40 are currently amended in this Reply.

It is respectfully requested that claim 12 be indicated allowable, as claim 12 depends from claim 10, which has been indicated allowable.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 19-21 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification, is respectfully requested. The Examiner questioned the term "mount to position" in claims 19-21. A mount is described at several places in the specification and the use of the mount to position the displays and the beam splitter also is described. Furthermore, the cubical

structure of claim 21 is described. Attention is invited to the specification page 12, the sentence beginning at line 5, "The monitor 40 includes a hinge 41 relative to which the displays 12a, 12b, linear polarizers 13a, 13b, and beam splitter 14 are mounted." Attention also is invited to specification page 24, the sentence beginning at line 10, "A cubical structure 81 having an open interior and at least three open sides 82, 83, 84 provides for alignment of and/or support of the displays 12a, 12b (associated polarizers) not shown)), and the beam splitter 14." These are two examples of an approach to mount the displays and beam splitter; it will be appreciated that other types of mounts or supports may be used.

Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-9, 12, 13, 15-18, 22, 27, 31-36, 39, 40, and 43-54 under 35 USC §102(e), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,130,784, (Takahashi), respectfully is requested for the following reasons.

As Examiner Lesperance has acknowledged, Takahashi does not teach or disclose two displays with polarization for both being the same so that images can be separated based on polarization. Claim 1 points out the polarization for both displays being the same and also points out the direct view of images from the displays such that the images can be separated based on polarization. Claims 2-9, 12, 13, 15-22, 27, 28, and 43-48 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, and, accordingly, those claims and claim 1 are not unpatentable in view of Takahashi.

Claim 31 points out that the optical polarization is in the same direction and also that image portions can be separated based on optical polarization. Claims 32, 33 and 49-51 depend from claim 31. Accordingly, claims 31-33 and 49-51 also would not be unpatentable in view of Takahashi.

Claim 34 points out optical polarization in the same direction and also that images can be separated based on polarization. Claims 35, 36, 39, 40, and 52-54 depend directly or indirectly from claim 34, and, accordingly, all of such claims are not unpatentable in view of Takahashi.

It is noted that Takahashi combines images and sends the combined image for viewing by one eye or in some instances the combined image is sent to both eyes of a person who is looking at the combined image. In contrast, in a sense the invention claimed in the instant application allows for multiplexing images and allows for demultiplexing the images based on polarization.

As in Takahashi, the present invention uses a non-polarizing beam splitter, but in the present invention the images are provided by light from displays that have the same polarization. Using the beam splitter to transmit one image without reflection and to reflect the other image in the instant invention, the images may be directed along a common channel or path, and the images can be separated based on polarization. In contrast, Takahashi provides images using light having polarization in different respective directions, namely, perpendicular to each other, and the images are combined for viewing rather than being separated or discriminated by polarization.

Additionally, there are other features set forth in the claims that are not disclosed or suggested in Takahashi. Several examples are, as follows:

The polarization being at 45°, etc., of claim 3;

The polarizers to separate images for right and left eye viewing of claim 4;

The quarter wave plates and left and right circular polarized light of claim 6;

The circular polarization and single quarter wave plate of claim 7;

The stereo pair of claim 8;

The directional organization of data in opposite directions on respective displays of claim 17;

The light absorber of claim 22;

The discriminating of respective images in a common light path using optical polarization of claim 32;

The opposite sequences of claim 33; and

The inverting of images of claims 36, 39, and 40.

A number of the aforementioned features also are pointed out in other pending claims. Furthermore, other pending claims point out features that are not disclosed in Takahashi, although they are not expressly itemized in the preceding listing.

#### CONCLUSION

In addition to the allowance of claim 30 and allowability of claims 10, 11, 14, 23-26, and 29, all the other claims in this application are allowable. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that a prompt Notice of Allowance be issued in this application.

If Examiner Lesperance has any further questions, he is invited to telephone Applicant's undersigned Attorney at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,  
RENNER OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

By Warren A. Sklar  
Warren A. Sklar, Reg. No. 26,373

1621 Euclid Avenue  
Nineteenth Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44115  
(216) 621-1113

#### CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence (along with any paper referenced as being attached or enclosed) is being facsimile transmitted to 703/872-9314 at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to the Attention of Jean Lesperance on the date below.

Date: July 31, 2003

Warren A. Sklar  
Warren A. Sklar

Z:\SEC113\WAS\VEI\AP103usa\Amd\_4\_Fnl.wpd was